Appendix A

Operable Unit 3-13 Responsiveness Summary

Public Comments and Responses on the OU 3-13 Proposed Plan

OVERVIEW

The Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center (INTEC), formerly known as the Idaho Chemical Processing Plant (ICPP), constitutes the Waste Area Group (WAG) 3, Operable Unit (OU) 3-13, at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL). There have been 99 releases or potential release sites (95 discussed in the Proposed Plan) and 15 OUs identified at INTEC. Operable Unit 3-13 is the latest investigation completed and represents the INTEC comprehensive remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS), including the 18 sites not previously assessed. Selected remedies were chosen for the 99 sites contained in this Record of Decision (ROD)

Forty of these sites were determined in the comprehensive RI/FS to have contamination that poses a potential risk to human health and the environment and that requires remedial action to reduce or eliminate those risks. During the RI/FS and Proposed Plan, these 40 contaminated sites were grouped into the following seven remedial action groups: (Tank Farm Soils [Group 1], Soils Under Buildings and Structures [Group 2], Other Surface Soils [Group 3], Perched Water [Group 4], Snake River Plain Aquifer [Group 5], Buried Gas Cylinders [Group 6], and SFE-20 Tank System [Group 7]). This grouping was done on a media or geographical location basis. Additionally, four sites have recently been added to WAG 3 that are similar to other WAG 3 sites within the remedial action groups requiring remediation. These sites have been added to the appropriate remedial action group (Site CPP-96 has been added to Group 1 and Sites CPP-97, -98, and -99 have been added to Group 3) and will be remediated using the same remedial action alternatives. For these seven remedial action groups, remedial action alternatives were evaluated, and preferred alternatives were selected. Also, there are two sites (CPP-38 and CPP-65) that will be remediated or closed under other regulatory programs and one site (CPP-66) that has been transferred to WAG 10 for further evaluation. One site (CPP-48), a proposed "No Action" site, has been determined to require additional action and will be part of Group 3. In addition to the 46 sites in the remedial action groups, two other sites requiring a remedial action, and one-transferred site, 50 sites were determined to pose an acceptable risk to human health and the environment and were identified by the Agencies as "No Action" and "No Further Action" sites.

A Proposed Plan that summarized the results of the RI/FS and presented the preferred remedial alternatives was released by the Agencies for public review on October 16, 1998. The initial Public review of this document took place between October 23, 1998, and December 22, 1998, which included an automatic 30-day extension to the comment period. Comments were received from 10 of the 55 people who attended the formal portions of the 4 public meetings. Written comments were received from 19 persons or groups. An additional 30-day review period (to February 12, 1999) was requested and used by 5 persons or groups to submit written comments. Public meetings were held in Idaho Falls, Twin Falls, Boise, and Moscow, Idaho on November 16, 17, 18, and 19, 1998, respectively.

This Responsiveness Summary responds to both written and verbal comments received during the comment period and meetings. Generally, support for the selected alternatives for each remedial action group was mixed.

BACKGROUND ON COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

In accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), Section 113(k)(2)(B)(I-V) and 117, a series of opportunities were available for public information and participation in the remedial investigation and decision process for OU 3-13, WAG 3 of INTEC (ICPP), from 1991 to present. For the public, the activities included receiving fact sheets that briefly discussed the status of the investigations to date, *INEEL Reporter* articles and updates, a Proposed Plan, and focus group interaction, along with teleconference calls, briefings, presentations, and public meetings.

During the week of October 18, 1998, the U.S. Department of Energy, Idaho Operations Office (DOE-ID) issued a news release to more than 100 media contacts concerning the beginning of the a 30-day public comment period pertaining to the WAG 3 OU 3-13 Proposed Plan. This period began on October 23, 1998; however, the comment period was automatically extended by the Agencies an additional 30 days in anticipation of large public interest. During the extended comment period, a request to extend the comment period was received. As a result, the extended comment period ended on February 12, 1999. Additionally, two "update fact sheets" were distributed to approximately 700 citizens on the INEEL Community Relations Plan mailing list. The first "update fact sheet" was distributed in November 1997 and the second was mailed out in September 1998. The purpose of the documents was to keep citizens appraised of the development during the RI/FS and to include a schedule of the investigation and announce the approximate dates that the public meetings would take place. These fact sheets also offered technical briefings to those interested in the WAG 3 investigation. The news releases gave notice to the public that WAG 3 INTEC (ICPP) supportive documents were available in the Administrative Record section of the INEEL Information Repositories located in the INEEL Technical Library in Idaho Falls, Albertson Library on the campus of Boise State University, and the University of Idaho Library in Moscow. Copies of the Proposed Plan were mailed to about 700 members of the public on the INEEL Community Relations Plan mailing list for review and comment. In addition, public meetings were held at Idaho Falls, Twin Falls, Boise, and Moscow, Idaho, on November 16, 17, 18, and 19, 1998, respectively. Written comment forms were available at the meetings, and a court reporter was present at each meeting to record transcripts of the discussions and public comments. A total of 34 citizens provided formal comments; of these, 10 provided verbal comments and 24 provided written comments.

This Responsiveness Summary has been prepared as part of the ROD. All formal verbal comments, as given at the public meetings, and all written comments, as submitted are included in the Administrative Record for the ROD. Those comments are annotated to indicate which response in this Responsiveness Summary addresses each comment. The ROD presents the selected alternative for each remedial action group along with the decisions on the "No Action" and "No Further Action" for the remaining sites. The preferred alternatives, in the Proposed Plan, were selected in accordance with CERCLA, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act, and to the extent practicable, the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (the National Contingency Plan [NCP]). The decisions presented in the ROD are based on the information contained in the Administrative Record. Additionally, the Administrative Record is available on the Internet at http://ar.inel.gov/home.html.

SUMMARY

Comments and questions raised during the public comment period on the Proposed Plan for the WAG 3 comprehensive RI/FS for OU 3-13 at INTEC (ICPP) are summarized below. The public meetings were divided into an informal question and answer session and a formal public comment session. The meeting format was described in published announcements, and reviewed with meeting attendees at the beginning of each meeting. The informal question and answer session was designed to provide immediate responses to the public's questions and concerns. Many questions were answered during the informal period of the public meetings on the Proposed Plan. Although this Responsiveness Summary does not respond to issues and concerns raised during the informal part of the public meetings, the Administrative Record contains complete transcripts of these meetings, which include the Agencies' responses to these questions, issues, and concerns.

Comments received during the formal comment session of the meetings are addressed by the Agencies in this Responsiveness Summary. The public was requested to provide their comments in writing, verbally during the public meetings, or by recording a message using the INEEL's toll-free number.

More than 25 individuals and/or groups provided oral and written comments on *the Proposed Plan for Waste Area Group 3 at the Idaho Chemical Processing Plant*. The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the State of Idaho agreed to extend the comment period an additional 30 days twice, giving the public an unprecedented 90 days to provide comments. The WAG 3 Proposed Plan garnered the most public interest of any Environmental Restoration (ER) project since Pit 9 was first discussed in 1992.

About one-third of the Commentors agreed with the preferred alternatives. Another one-third thought the Agencies were not taking enough cleanup actions. While a third still thought the Agencies should take little or no action at the INTEC facility.

What makes the WAG 3 Proposed Plan unique is the national interest the document, and preferred alternatives, generated. All members of Idaho's Congressional Delegation provided written comments. The comments received were beneficial in our development of this ROD. Of principal concern to the Delegation was the siting of a site-wide contaminated soil repository at the INTEC facility, the INEEL CERCLA Disposal Facility (ICDF), which lies about 450 feet above the Snake River Plain Aquifer (SRPA).

A majority of public comments also focused on the site-wide soil repository. The major concern was the long-term protection of the sole-source SRPA. Many members of the public worried about: future contaminant migration from the soil repository; the proposed location of the repository; and ensuring that applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) are met.

Many public comments also addressed existing groundwater contamination beneath the INTEC facility. Some Commentors stated that the Agencies were not going far enough in implementing remediation to quickly reduce contamination. Others commented that the Agencies should let dilution and natural attenuation occur to reduce the groundwater contamination. Still, others questioned the hydrogeological assumptions made in the Proposed Plan and RI/FS. These comments focused on the relationship of the percolation ponds to the perched water contamination, and on the relationship of the perched water bodies to groundwater contamination.

In general, protection of the SRPA was a significant concern to regional news media. Editorials ran in the Twin Falls *Times-News, Wood River Journal* (Hailey), and *Idaho Statesman* (Boise), criticizing the proposed soil repository for leaving contaminants over the SRPA.

LISTING OF COMMENTORS AND COMMENT NUMBERING

All of the formal comments submitted by the public in either written or oral form were tabulated, summarized briefly and assigned a comment number. If the Commentor affiliation is unknown or the Commentors are expressing their individual opinion, "Concerned Citizen" is shown as the affiliation. An index of the comments and the page number that the comment appears on is provided at the end of this Responsiveness Summary. Comments are indexed based on the initials of the author (U for unknown) and identified as either written (W) or public meeting along with location (TI for Idaho Falls meeting, TT for Twin Falls, TB for Boise and TM for Moscow). Table 1 presents the Commentors, their affiliation, initials code, and comment type (written or public meeting) for the Commentor's comments.

Table 1. Authors of the comments on the Proposed Plan, their affiliation, and codes used for comment numbering.

Name	Affiliation	Commentor's Initials	Comment Type
Mr. Jobe	Coalition 21	LJ	TI
Beatrice Brailsford	Snake River Alliance	BB	TI
Peter Rickards	Concerned Citizen	PR	TT
David Kipping	Snake River Alliance	DK	TT
Margaret McDonald Steward	Snake River Alliance	MMS	TT
Pamela Allister	Snake River Alliance	PA-SRA	TB
Pamela Allister	Concerned Citizen	PA	TB
Steve Ramono	American Ecology, Inc.	SR	TB
Chuck Broscious	Environmental Defense Institute	CB	TM
Jeff Jones	Concerned Citizen	JJ	TM
Chuck Rice	INEEL Citizens Advisory Board	CAB	W
Albert Taylor	Concerned Citizen	AT	W
Paul Randolph	Concerned Citizen	PaR	W
Chuck Broscious	Environmental Defense Institute	CB-W	W
Thornton Waite	Concerned Citizen	TW	W
Shannon Ansley	Concerned Citizen	SA	W
Robin VanHorn	Concerned Citizen	RV	W
Representative, Helen Chenoweth	Idaho First Congressional District	HC	W
Jack Lemley	Lemley and Associates	L	W
John Commander	Coalition 21	C21	W
Chris Coperfield	Concerned Citizen	CC	W
Margret McDonald Steward	Snake River Alliance	MMS-W	W
David Hensel	Concerned Citizen	DH	W
Anonymous	Concerned Citizen	A	W
Robert Bobo	Consultant to Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	SBT	W
Beatrice Brailsford	Snake River Alliance	SRA	W
James McCarthy	Concerned Citizen	JM	W
Christinna ?	Concerned Citizen	C	W

Table 1. (continued).

Name	Affiliation	Commentor's Initials	Comment Type
Frank Priestley	Idaho Farm Bureau Federation	IFBF	W
Representative Mike Simpson, and Senators Larry Craig and Mike Crapo	Idaho Congressional Delegation	MS	W
Barbara Robertson	Concerned Citizen	BR	W
Richard Kuehn	Concerned Citizen	RK	W
Unknown	Concerned Citizen	U	W
Beatrice Brailsford	Snake River Alliance	SRA2	W

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS

AIP	Agreement in Principle
ANL-W	Argonne National Laboratory-West
AOC	area of contamination
ARARs	applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements
BLR	Big Lost River
CAB	Citizens Advisory Board
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CFA	Central Facilities Area
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
COCs	contaminants of concern
D&D	decontamination and dismantlement
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
DOE-ID	U.S. Department of Energy, Idaho Operations Office
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ER	Environmental Restoration
ESD	explanation of significant differences
FFA/CO	Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order
FS	feasibility study
FSS	feasibility study supplement
HEU	Highly Enriched Uranium
HI	hazard index
HLW	high level waste
HWMA	Hazardous Waste Management Act

IC	Institutional Control
ICDF	INEEL CERCLA Disposal Facility
ICPP	Idaho Chemical Processing Plant
Idaho HLW & FD EIS	Idaho High Level Waste and Facilities Disposition Environmental Impact Statement
IDW	investigation derived waste
IDWH/DEQ	Idaho Department of Health and Welfare/Division of Environmental Quality
INEEL	Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory
INTEC	Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center
LDR	Land Disposal Restriction
LLW	low-level waste
M&O	management and operations
MCLs	maximum contaminant levels
MLLW	mixed low-level waste
MTRs	Minimum Technical Requirements
NCP	National Contingency Plan
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NPL	National Priority List
NPV	Net Present Value
NRC	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NSI	New Site Identification
NWCF	New Waste Calcining Facility
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OU	operable unit
PCB	polychlorinated biphenyl
RAO	remedial action objective

RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RI/BRA	remedial investigation/baseline risk assessment
RI/FS	remedial investigation/feasibility study
ROD	Record of Decision
RWMC	Radioactive Waste Management Complex
SBW	Sodium Bearing Waste
SNF	Spent Nuclear Fuel
SRPA	Snake River Plain Aquifer
SRS	Savannah River Site
STP	Sewage Treatment Plant
STP	Site Treatment Plan
TAN	Test Area North
TAP	
TBC	to be considered
TCLP	toxic characterization leaching procedure
TI	Technical Impracticability
TRA	Test Reactor Area
TRU	transuranic
TSCA	Toxic Substances Control Act
USGS	United States Geological Survey
WAC	waste acceptance criteria
WAG	waste area group
WIPP	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant
WLAP	wastewater land application program

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS WITH RESPONSES

Comments presented during the public comment period on the Proposed Plan for the INTEC Comprehensive RI/FS are given below. The public meetings were divided into a presentation, an informal question-and-answer session, and a formal public comment session. The meeting format was described in published announcements, and meeting attendees were reminded of the format at the beginning of the meeting. The informal question-and-answer session was designed to provide immediate responses to the public's questions and concerns. Several questions were answered during the informal period of the public meetings on the Proposed Plan. This Responsiveness Summary does not attempt to summarize or respond to issues and concerns raised during the informal part of the public meetings. However, the Administrative Record contains complete transcripts of these meetings, which include the Agencies' responses to these informal questions.

Comments received during the formal comment session of the meetings and written comments received during the public comment period are addressed by the Agencies in this Responsiveness Summary. The public was requested to provide their comments in writing, orally during the public meetings, or by recording a message using the INEEL's toll-free number. The comments below are printed and occasionally summarized. Edits made were to correct minor spelling, editorial errors, and elimination of non-comment related information. In those cases where written comments were received that were difficult to read, a best attempt to interpret the comment is provided. Copies of the originally written comments are provided in the Administrative Record file for INTEC.

The comments made on the Proposed Plan, from the formal part of public meetings and written, have been grouped into various subject categories. These comments have been grouped into four general categories: A: WAG 3 Cleanup and Public Participation, B: The CERCLA Process at WAG 3, C: Release Site Groups at WAG 3, and D: Other Issues. Each of these major categories has subcategories for the specific comment topics. These subject categories and corresponding comments are presented below. For each comment, a response has been developed and is presented following the comment.

A. WAG 3 CLEANUP AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A.1. Overall Goals and Structure of the INEEL ER Program

Comment 1 : A concern was expressed that the Agencies are looking at the risks associated with leaving the identified sites in place or remediating them, but are not considering the other contaminated sites which are still at the INTEC and thus, not looking at the "whole" picture. [TW-W]

Response: We are looking at source areas on a case by case basis and extending from the individual unit to the OU and to the WAG 3 as a whole. The scope of the WAG 3, OU 3-13 is defined as the known or suspected release sites identified in the Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (FFA/CO) and supporting documents. Although we will be revisiting selected aspects of the WAG 3 investigation under the OU 3-14 RI/FS, our evaluation of source areas listed under the FFA/CO, did address the potential cumulative effects of each "source area" on INTEC as a whole. Consideration of the ultimate fate and disposition of buildings and structures at INTEC is not part of the scope for OU 3-13. The Idaho High Level Waste and Facilities Disposition Environmental Impact Statement (Idaho HLW & FD EIS) is currently considering options for the disposition of INTEC facilities associated with the generation, treatment, or storage of high level waste (HLW). In addition, the Idaho HLW & FD EIS is also considering the other facilities at INTEC for their impact on the cumulative risk. With this in mind, the Idaho HLW & FD EIS should complement the WAG 3 RI/FS in addressing the "whole picture." Refinements to the risk calculations will continue as sites are remediated and facilities and structures

closed. Other programs (e.g., Hazardous Waste Management Act [HWMA], Governor's Agreement, [TAP]) oversee other elements of INEEL environmental management. Together, along with DOE-ID decontamination and dismantlement (D&D) planning, these programs should achieve a protective end state for the future.

Comment 2 : A concern was expressed that the Agencies seem to lack of a comprehensive decision process. "Where will we be when we get there? What is this site going to be like when we're through cleaning up?" If it's leaving soil in place that you folks are proposing to put in an engineered landfill, and how do those two decisions relate? Down the road we are going to have a lot of bits and pieces? By the time of WAG 10 we will have made a lot of our commitments. There is no overall controlling philosophy for what is going on at the different WAGs. [BB-TI]

Response: The scope of the WAG 3, OU 3-13 is limited to known or suspected release sites identified in the FFA/CO. The process followed is a consistent one, applied for all INEEL WAG decisions made to date. We do look at site-wide issues, but the hazards and potential hazards occur at the "source" level. Our decision process is based on identification and response to threats posed on a source-by-source basis. A case in point is the ICDF where we do attempt to look at the INEEL-wide needs through the creation of a site-wide CERCLA disposal facility. WAG 10 is intended to evaluate the cumulative impacts within the SRPA from the overlapping groundwater plumes as a result of INEEL activities and to make a final assessment of ecological risks and impacts. As such, decisions can be made at the individual WAGs and then be rolled into WAG 10 for analysis of cumulative risks. In addition, the remedial actions taken on the SRPA are intended to ensure the aquifer meets acceptable risk concentrations and drinking water maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) for future residents, and workers are protected from drinking water which exceeds MCLs, or risk-based concentrations. For the SFE-20 Tank System, complete removal, treatment, and disposal is the most cost effective and risk reducing option evaluated. As for the ultimate disposition of waste remaining in the INTEC Tank Farm tanks, the decision is expected to be made in the ROD for the Idaho HLW & FD EIS, and the HWMA closure process.

Comment 3 : A Commentor identified that as a visitor through the Chemical Processing Plant when under construction around 50 years ago, he was interested in the clean up process now going on. "It's too bad so many mistakes were made in past years. I think your recommendations are the best available. Please continue to protect the Snake River Aquifer from ANY serious contamination." [AT-W]

Response: We thank the Commentor for his thoughts on the cleanup of INTEC. One of the primary goals of the OU 3-13 project is to ensure the portion of the SRPA, a sole source aquifer, impacted by INTEC operations meets acceptable risk concentrations and drinking water MCLs for future residents, and workers are protected from drinking water that exceeds MCLs, or risk-based concentrations.

Comment 4 : A Commentor requested, "Simply get all the crap off of and out of the Aquifer! Please!" [PaR-W]

Response: We appreciate the comments and are committed to protecting potential future users of the SRPA from INEEL activities. One of the primary goals of the OU 3-13 project is to ensure the portion of the SRPA, a sole source aquifer, impacted by INTEC operations meets acceptable risk concentrations and drinking water MCLs for future residents, and workers are protected from drinking water which exceeds MCLs, or risk-based concentrations.

Comment 5 : A concern was expressed to the Agencies of the importance of the SRPA, not only the economic value, but the related perceptual value. [SR-TB]

Response: Although the Commentor is correct in that perceptions were not formally analyzed in the RI/FS evaluation, impacts from perceptions can be assessed through our Community involvement process. In addition to informal and formal public comment opportunities, an Idaho-Citizens Focus Group and the INEEL Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) both provided their input. Community input is an important factor in our decision process.

Comment 6 : A concern was expressed that the Agencies' decisions about the Tank Farm were not made. These other decisions will limit the soil clean-up options as will the cleanup of dozens of buildings at the Chem Plant. The plan doesn't address how or when to decontaminate those buildings. We won't even know what waste will be allowed in the ICDF until after it's approved. "Where will we be when we get there? What will be left behind?" [PA-SRA-TB]

Response: The scope of the WAG 3, OU 3-13 is defined as the known or suspected release sites identified in the FFA/CO. In the case of the Tank Farm, the proposed interim action will not be inconsistent with the final action and will not limit the cleanup options. Consideration of the ultimate fate and disposition of buildings and structures at INTEC is not part of the scope for OU 3-13. The OU 3-13 ROD and Idaho HLW & FD EIS ROD will be linked together for the purpose of restoring the area of INTEC to an acceptable risk. The scope of the Idaho HLW & FD EIS does not cover facilities and structures outside of INTEC. Analysis and decisions on the non-INTEC facilities and structures will be covered in future documents. Also, although the D&D program is not part of OU 3-13, new sites can be added to the FFA/CO if found to present an unacceptable risk to human health and the environment.

In the case the ICDF, the waste acceptance criteria will be developed during the remedial design. Candidate materials for disposal in the repository were identified and evaluated (see Appendix C of the *Comprehensive RI/FS for the Idaho Chemical Processing Plant OU 3-13 at the INEEL Part B, FS Supplement Report* (DOE/ID-10619), which is contained in the Administrative Record). The waste acceptance criteria, developed in the remedial design, will limit the material acceptable for disposal such that the repository will not adversely impact the SRPA or surface receptors. Information concerning the schedules and approaches are contained in the INEEL 2006 Plan. Also, conceptual issues and approaches are contained in the DOE End State Planning document.

Comment 7 : A concern was expressed that the Agencies adopt a site-wide policy that active radioactive disposal facilities overlying the SRPA are permanently closed during the initial 5-year period covered by the department's upcoming INEEL management and operation (M&O) contract. This policy direction should be prominently featured in the final Request for Proposals issued by the department. [HC-W]

Response: We believe the Commentor is referring to the existing on-site low-level waste (LLW) disposal facility located at the Radioactive Waste Management Complex (RWMC), which is not part of the WAG 3 decision process. With regards to the new M&O contract, the Agencies are fully committed to environmentally sound management practices. Given the subject matter, this comment was also forwarded to the Source Evaluation Board working on the new M&O contract for consideration.

Comment 8 : A Commentor was concerned that tremendous pressure would exist to bury other, heterogeneous wastes at the new facility after it was built. The cumulative effect of these factors merits analysis. [L-W]

Response: Non-CERCLA wastes will not be placed within the ICDF and further, would be subject to state and federal permitting requirements outside the scope of this ROD. The waste acceptance criteria (WAC) for the ICDF will factor in the cumulative effects of the wastes that will be placed within the

landfill and establish limits to safeguard the aquifer. This approach is consistent with our method for determining if an unacceptable risk exists under our baseline risk assessment, in the RI/FS.

Comment 9 : One Commentor recommended that we adopt a comprehensive, INEEL-wide policy of minimizing further burial of radioactive and mixed wastes over the SRPA, and pursue alternatives to the accelerated use and full utilization of remaining RWMC Subsurface Disposal Area burial capacity. [L-W]

Response: This comment relates to waste management practices at the INEEL and the future use of the RWMC. The proposed Plan and this ROD address the most cost-effective remedial action for past practice source areas at WAG 3. The ICDF will provide safe management for INEEL CERCLA waste. The RWMC also overlies the SRPA and is operated to dispose of low-level radioactive waste. The ICDF will accept soil and debris contaminated with both radionuclides and hazardous constituents. Disposal of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) and RCRA wastes require stringent engineering controls that the ICDF will incorporate.

Comment 10 : A concern was expressed that the Agencies' plan on the Chem Plant cleanup seems fine in and of itself. The problems lie mainly in that it doesn't address the difficult cleanup problems, nor does there seem to be an overall view of what the final outcome for the whole site will be. For example, the tank farm and the soil under it are considered in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). This will be a daunting and expensive cleanup project. Will there be money for this project? Where and when does it fit in the final outcome—a clean INEEL? [DH-W]

Response: It is recognized that cleaning up will be a complex and difficult task. The Proposed Plan summarized the information contained in the Remedial Investigation/Baseline Risk Assessment (RI/BRA) Report (DOE/ID-10534), Feasibility Study (FS) Report (DOE/ID-10572), and the Feasibility Study Supplement (FSS) Report (DOE/ID-10619), which can be found in the Administrative Record. The final cleanup of INTEC will result in an acceptable risk (1 in 10,000 cumulative carcinogenic) for both the SRPA (also restored to safe drinking water standards) and surface receptors. The Idaho HLW & FD EIS will evaluate the treatment of the waste in the tanks and evaluate the disposition of facilities associated with the generation, treatment, storage, and disposal of HLW. Concerning the funding issue, sufficient funding will be requested from Congress to complete the cleanup activities. The decision to fund cleanup activities lies with Congress and the President. As facilities are closed and dispositioned, the impacts will be factored into the cumulative risk for INTEC. Waste Area Group 10 will evaluate the cumulative impacts to the SRPA from across the entire INEEL.

Comment 11 : A concern was expressed to the Agencies that CERCLA requires 5-year reviews of decisions, even if they are not interim actions. How many such reviews are contemplated for each OU at the Chem Plant? [SRA-W]

Response: As long as a CERCLA area requires restricted or limited access or use to safeguard human health and the environment, reviews at least every 5 years are required. The entire area of INTEC (ICPP), covered by the scope of the ROD, would be included into a single periodic review. These 5-year reviews will apply to both access and use restrictions. In addition, these reviews will continue until the Agencies determine that they are no longer necessary.

Comment 12 : A question was asked, "Are there individual facilities or OUs that are covered both by Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and by CERCLA? Will the CERCLA ROD incorporate RCRA concerns?"[SRA-W]

Response: The Agencies are committed to minimizing the duplication of work between the HWMA (i.e., RCRA) and CERCLA programs. Toward this end the FFA/CO incorporates RCRA corrective action and

CERCLA remedial action under a single process. In addition, considering the general equivalency of the RCRA/HWMA closure and post-closure process to the FFA/CO remedial actions, the Agencies will make every attempt to incorporate the monitoring and maintenance of closed units (e.g., Old Waste Calciner) under this action, if requested by the authorized program.

Comment 13 : A concern was expressed that at Page 49, 1st partial paragraph, of the Proposed Plan, hints that CERCLA may be a permanent program at the INEEL. "When does the FFA/CO end and the RCRA Corrective Action process begin? Routine operational releases should not be included as new sites under the FFA/CO. They must be addressed through a spill cleanup, or if a SWMU, through RCRA Corrective Action. Once the RODs are written for OU3-14 and WAG 10, the CERCLA process at ICPP should be complete, except for the "'5-year" reviews and ongoing remediation. There should be no "new sites" under CERCLA." [C-W]

Response: The CERCLA and RCRA corrective action at INEEL is an ongoing program. The program is responsible for assessing the risk from releases and potential releases of hazardous substances on the INEEL. Following assessment of this risk, the sites are restored to acceptable risk-based levels. Ongoing releases from RCRA/HWMA permitted operations are not addressed under the FFA/CO, but instead under the permit. Routine operational releases are not part of the FFA/CO. If the operational releases represent an unacceptable risk to human health and the environment, and are not under a RCRA/HWMA permit, additional actions under the FFA/CO may be necessary and undertaken. When newly identified contaminated areas (release sites) are discovered, the information is compiled and placed into the system for consideration as a "New Site" under the FFA/CO.

Comment 14 : A request was made that the Agencies compare the "risk" posed by tank farm soil with the "risk" posed by pits and trenches. [SRA-W]

Response: Risks are compared against a national standard (the NCP) as to acceptable risk, 10E-4 to 10E-6 cumulative carcinogenic and a hazard index (HI) >1. If risks are found outside this range, remedial action is necessary. Comparing the risks from the INTEC Tank Farm soils against the waste in the pits and trenches at the RWMC, would identify that both areas are outside the acceptable risk range and require remedial action to be protective of human health and the environment.

A.1.1 Results/Outcomes of the ER Program

Comment 15 : A Commentor summarized the preferred alternatives for managing contaminated soils contained in the Proposed Plan. [SRA-W]

Response: The Commentor's summary was correct. Contaminated soil will be capped by this action, either within the ICDF, or under an existing building or contained in place.

Comment 16 : A concern was expressed to the Agencies that, when the INEEL "cleanup" is done, an enormous amount of nuclear contamination will remain above the Snake River Aquifer and we won't know the cumulative extent of the remaining peril until most of the predicted cleanup resources are gone. [SRA-W]

Response: The resources available to address nuclear contamination are indeed limited at INEEL and other federal facilities. However, we believe that the actions we have selected represent an appropriate balance between cost and effectiveness. One of our goals is to reduce the footprint of contaminated areas on INEEL we will need to restrict access to and monitor indefinitely. Another goal is to clean up the aquifer so that it is available to future generations.

Comment 17 : A concern was expressed that neither the tank farm nor the surrounding soil is covered in the current plan. Decisions about the waste tanks themselves have yet to be made; those decisions may limit the soil cleanup options. Further, there are dozens of buildings at the Chem Plant, and some are highly contaminated. The current plan doesn't address how or when to decontaminate those buildings. We won't even know what waste will be allowed in the ICDF until after it's approved. Many of the specific concerns grow out of the general lack of a clear end state or end time for Chem Plant operation, remediation, and closure. [SRA-W]

Response: The Commentor is correct that highly contaminated areas at INTEC are located within the Tank Farm area. The tanks and the waste in the tanks in the Tank Farm are being addressed under the Idaho HLW & FD EIS. Although the waste in the tanks is not covered in the Proposed Plan, the soils in the Tank Farm area are covered and are contained in Group 1 (Tank Farm Soils). We do not have a complete understanding of the threat posed to the underlying groundwater by the contaminated soil column at the Tank Farm. This is why we are implementing an interim action for the Tank Farm Soils. Concerning decisions made regarding the tanks and tank waste impacting the soils remediation, this is an issue that will be factored into the remedial action alternatives evaluation, in the OU 3-14 RI/FS. For the ICDF, the soils and debris that will be accepted will be limited to minimize the threat to the SRPA. Some soils and debris will likely require pretreatment prior to disposal in the repository or off-site disposal. At this time there is not an approved final end-state developed for INTEC.

Comment 18 : A concern was expressed on how much residual risk had been left site-wide after cleanup? What will be the cumulative risk left at the Chem Plant? [SRA-W]

Response: Remediation under the CERCLA program is directed at restoring the environment to an acceptable risk level (10E-4 to 10E-6 cumulative carcinogenic). Cleanups that have occurred and will occur under this ROD are designed to reduce the risk from the 99 source areas to an acceptable level. Site-wide cumulative risk is being evaluated under WAG 10 for impacts on the ecological receptors and the SRPA from INEEL operations and activities.

Comment 19 : A request was made to describe how much nuclear waste from the Chem Plant cleanup will likely leave Idaho. [SRA-W]

Response: Both the transuranic (TRU) and HLW from INTEC cleanup under this ROD will be transported off-site for disposal. We do not estimate this to be a large volume. The wastes contained within the High Level Tanks and Calciner Bins are a subject of the Governor's Agreement and not addressed under this action.

Comment 20 : A Commentor exclaimed, "Cleanup this nuclear hazard ... Now! With most of Superfunds monies going to lawyers over litigation, it is no wonder that when all is said and done, there is more said than done! However, with two facts clear to anyone concerned about their quality of life in Idaho: i.e., (1) 200 million dollars over budget on cleanup, (2) 26 months behind schedule on cleanup." [RK-W]

Response: The Agencies are committed to expeditious cleanup at INEEL. These cleanups are funded through agency (DOE) appropriations by Congress. Implementation of federal facility remedial actions, like that under the FFA/CO, do not generally involve litigation. The remedial action that the Commentor is referring to, the Pit 9 project, has experienced difficulties with sub-contractors. Measures have been taken to address those problems and fulfill the requirements of this earlier ROD.

A.2. Public Participation and Community Relations

Comment 21 : A Commentor stated that providing drafts of proposed plans is a constructive process that extends the comment period beyond the traditional "decide, announce, defend" mode formerly used by DOE. [CB-W]

Response: The Agencies used a different approach for the development of the OU 3-13 Proposed Plan. The approach included using a focus group and the INEEL CAB for review and comment during the development of the OU 3-13 Proposed Plan.

Comment 22 : A Commentor appreciated the fact that we are spending so much time and energy going into the communities and appreciated the presentations as was clear, concise, speedy, and very understandable. [PA-SRA-TB]

Response: We thank the Commentor for the comment. A considerable amount of effort was expended to develop the presentations that would answer some of the questions the public would have on the information in the Proposed Plan.

Comment 23 : A Commentor thought that it's great that the Agencies went out and tried to spread to the public and get the public involved and let them know what's going on. [JJ-TM]

Response: We thank the Commentor for the comment. The Agencies are committed to informing the public on the risks and alternatives being considered to remediate the contamination areas.

Comment 24 : A Commentor requested an extension of the comment period. [HC-W]

Response: Due to the expected public interest in the Proposed Plan for the ICPP, we initially held a 30-day comment period with a 30-day extension which started October 23rd, 1998 ended December 22nd, 1998. The Commentor was unable to participate during the first extension and was very concerned that members of the public be given additional time to submit comments. Due to these unusual circumstances, we extended the comment period until February 12th, 1999.

Comment 25 : A Commentor requested that each participating agency carefully weigh the public's input before final remedy selection. [L-W]

Response: The Agencies have continued to support a strong public involvement process to include many briefings before the INEEL CAB, Community Focus Group and two 30-day extensions to the public comment period. Comments received from the community are evaluated and factored into the decision making (remedial alternative selection) through the modifying criteria of "community acceptances." In addition, the comments received along with responses are contained in this Responsiveness Summary, which is part of the ROD.

Comment 26 : A Commentor offered a comment based on professional experience observing the diminished influence of science in our society, public mistrust of government handling of radiation safety issues, and the information revolution which has forever ended the days when programs such as this could be implemented with little public attention. It is essential that the Department work within the decision environment, and undertakes environmental restoration actions based on permanent solutions that will stand the tests of time and scrutiny. The Commentor believed that the proposed approach to SRPA protection fell short of this standard. [L-W]

Response: We recognize the importance of public participation and deliberate execution of well founded responses. Our decision environment is highly dependent on involvement by Stakeholders and the public.

The process followed is that established nationally for the cleanup of National Priorities List (NPL) sites and incorporates scientific and engineering services, compatible with the state of the practice. Our contingency action for the drinking water aquifer will assure that the aquifer is restored to drinking water standards and available for future generations.

Comment 27 : A Commentor felt that the Agencies are trying to approach and describe the problems presented by the pollution at the Chem Plant in a refreshingly real world fashion. [SRA-W]

Response: We thank the Commentor for their complement.

Comment 28 : A Commentor felt that the Agencies were opening a legal dump for plutonium and requested that an EIS scoping process be used to identify the total amount of plutonium being buried. [PR-TT]

Response: Evaluation of the ICDF was conducted as part of a CERCLA investigation and decision making process. It is the Agencies' position that CERCLA is functionally equivalent to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. As such, no additional scoping or NEPA is required for the ICDF. Also, the ICDF would be restricted to the acceptance of waste with TRU-constituents at a total maximum concentration of <10 nCi/g.

Comment 29 : The INEEL CAB recommended that the Agencies more seriously consider comments submitted by the Board informally (not just formal recommendations) and through discussions. [CAB-W]

Response: The Agencies regret that the INEEL CAB felt that its comments were not fully incorporated in the Proposed Plan. We believe that the issue related primarily to the identification of the specific location of the ICDF in the Proposed Plan. At the time of the public comment period, the Agencies had not completed a siting evaluation on the best location for the ICDF. We did suggest in the Proposed Plan that the location was in the vicinity of the existing Percolation Ponds within the area of contamination (AOC). We have only completed a portion of the siting evaluation, which is included in this ROD.

Comment 30 : The INEEL CAB appreciated the opportunity to be involved in this document throughout its preparation. The Board, primarily through our High Level Waste Committee, was provided with ample information and with the opportunity to ask questions and make suggestions on the plan at various stages. This experience contrasted with the CAB's earlier experience evaluating other proposed plans. [CAB-W]

Response: We appreciate the comment. The approach to developing the Proposed Plan for OU 3-13 was different that used in developing previous Proposed Plan at the INEEL. In addition to working with the INEEL CAB, a citizen's focus group reviewed and commented on a draft version of the Proposed Plan. By working with both the INEEL CAB High-Level Waste Committee, issues were addressed prior to finalizing the Proposed Plan. We felt that this was helpful in taking a complex project, OU 3-13, and being able to present the information to the public in an understandable way.

Comment 31 : A Commentor thanked us for extending the comment period, and for releasing the plan for public comment. While efforts (as indicated below) at public relations have a long way to go, the effort made thus far is commendable. [U-W]

Response: We thank the Commentor. The comment period was extended to allow for additional public comment on the Proposed Plan. In addition to the Proposed Plan, meetings on the Proposed Plan were held in Idaho Falls, Twin Falls, Boise, and Moscow, Idaho to inform and received input from the public.

A.3. Content and Organization of the Proposed Plan

Comment 32 : A Commentor felt that a great deal of effort was made with this particular plan. I think it's one of the most clearly and easily read plans that I have had to tackle on my late night journeys through these documents. [PA-SRA-TB]

Response: We thank the Commentor for the comment. A considerable amount of effort was expended to try and summarize the information contained in the OU 3-13 RI/FS into summary discussions for the Proposed Plan, which were understandable. It appears that we were successful.

Comment 33 : A Commentor felt that the Proposed Plan was certainly an improvement over the draft plan, and thought that it pointed to the usefulness of including the public and the Stakeholders earlier in the process, so as to try to encourage ironing out problems prior to getting into a formal thing that gets out on the street, and by that time most everybody is kind of into a locked position of what they've decided, they present it, and then they defend it. [CB-TM]

Response: A different approach than used in the past was used for the development of the OU 3-13 Proposed Plan. The approach included using a focus group and the INEEL CAB for review and comment during the development of the OU 3-13 Proposed Plan.

Comment 34 : A Commentor felt that the document did not give basic information that a member of the public could use to make an informed decision about whether the Agencies were really addressing the problem. [CB-TM]

Response: The Proposed Plan is only a summary document on the information contained in the RI/BRA, FS, and FS Supplemental Reports. The detailed information on the contaminant concentrations, risks, and alternative evaluations is contained in these documents. Additional information for the release sites at INTEC is contained in the Track 1 and Track 2 documents. All of these documents are contained in the Administrative Record.

Comment 35 : A Commentor recommended listing and definitions of acronyms used in the Plan. [C21-W]

Response: We are sorry for the confusion concerning acronyms and definitions. Many of the acronyms and concepts in the Proposed Plan were discussed in the sidebars of the document. Documents in the future may include a table showing the acronyms along with complete words. In addition, the concepts will continue to be discussed in either a table or sidebars.

Comment 36 : A Commentor recommended providing a list of key references. [C21-W]

Response: The key references for the OU 3-13 Proposed Plan were included in the text on Page 2, Paragraph 4. In the future, more attention will be given to pointing the readers to where additional information can be found, either by highlighting or a table.

Comment 37 : A Commentor recommended the addition of a simplified method for enabling the readers to understand the relationships between "group numbers," "operable units," and "CPP numbers" as used throughout the Plan. [C21-W]

Response: We agree with the Commentor. The use of group numbers, OUs, and CPP numbers was confusing. With the development of the FFA/CO, WAG 3, INTEC, was divided into individual release

sites. These release sites were assigned the CPP numbers. The release sites were then grouped into OU numbers based on type of release, location of release, and other criteria. The OU and CPP numbers were used in assessing the risk individually and as a whole for WAG 3. As a result of the risk assessment, not all release sites presented an unacceptable risk and were eliminated from further consideration. In developing the FS, the unacceptable risk release sites were grouped by the expected remedial actions into the group numbers. This was done to simplify and reduce the number of sites being discussed. In the future, a better attempt will be made to simplify and explain the release sites within a WAG.

Comment 38 : As a member of the focus group that helped INEEL devise a "publicly readable" document, a Commentor appreciated the time and effort that had gone into the Proposed Plan. It was indeed readable, "user friendly," and visually, the best WAG Cleanup Plan I've yet seen. However, the contents of the plan left the reader with feelings of uncertainty, of reading a plan published in a hurry without enough solid science and technology to back up the plan, and without a clear definition of what cleanup really means. [MMS-W-W]

Response: We are sorry that the Commentor was left with the feeling that the Proposed Plan was inadequate. The Proposed Plan was a summary of the information in the RI/FS for OU 3-13. There is a balance between detailed and summary information in order to produce a Proposed Plan that presents sufficient information without being excessively lengthy and complex. We will endeavor, in future Proposed Plans to reduce the uncertainty for the reader while remaining user friendly.

Comment 39 : A Commentor felt that we'd know more if contaminants of concern (COCs) were listed by level of concern rather than more or less alphabetically. Attaching half-lives (when applicable) would be appropriate. As it is, it's difficult to see whether 2095 has anything other than an administrative value. [SRA-W]

Response: A list of COCs has been included in this ROD showing how the contaminants rank from a level of concern. In addition, the half-lives, where applicable, of the various COCs are presented in the ROD. The use of the year 2095 relates primarily to what the Agencies believe to be a reasonable time frame that governmental ownership of the land will remain. Beyond this time it is difficult to predict what land use pressure may exist and unless there are other factors to consider, we assume that residential use is a reasonable scenario unless other extenuating circumstances exist.

Comment 40 : A Commentor found no complete discussion of the ICDF and wanted a more complete discussion on the ICDF. Included should be: details of construction; where waste would come from; how much waste; and how much of the cost would be assigned to WAG 3. [C21-W]

Response: Only a summary level discussion of the ICDF was contained in the Proposed Plan. For evaluation purposes in the FS and Feasibility Study Supplement (FSS) Reports, a conceptual remedial alternative concerning on-site disposal was developed. This conceptual alternative was evaluated for risk (surface and groundwater) impacts along with other criteria including cost. Additional details concerning construction, wastes, and cost of the ICDF is contained in the ROD. More discussion on the design parameters are found in this ROD. The actual design and construction details of the ICDF will be developed in the remedial design. Information on the candidate wastes and volumes can be found in Appendix C of the FSS Report. Concerning the ICDF costs assigned to WAG 3, the bottom of Table 11 (page 48) of the Proposed Plan presented both the total cost (all WAGs) and the cost for WAG 3 only.

Comment 41 : A Commentor felt that at Page 12, Table 1, of the Proposed Plan, the values given appeared to be the predicted peak aquifer concentrations for the year 2095, not the year 2095 and beyond. With the exception of I-129, all the values are inconsistent with the values given in the RI report. [JM-W]

Response: We assume the Commentor was referring to Page 18, Table 1. The concentrations shown are for year 2095 and not as stated in the Proposed Plan (2095 and beyond). These concentrations were presented and used for the evaluation of cleanup criteria (MCLs and risks). In addition, some of the values presented in the Proposed Plan are less than presented in the RI/BRA Report. For the RI/BRA, the values that were presented were the maximum contaminant concentrations at various time intervals without respect to spatial locations. This resulted in contaminants from multiple locations to be added together, resulting in over prediction of impacts.

Comment 42 : A Commentor questioned why the term "mostly" was used at Page 36, Snake River Plain, and 1st paragraph. "The COCs are mostly radionuclides and mercury." What other contaminants were of concern? [C-W]

Response: We are sorry that this is confusing in the Proposed Plan. The correct list of COCs for the SRPA are radionuclides and mercury. Other contaminants like Chromium listed on Page 15 is a result of evaluating the cumulative impacts on the SRPA from both INTEC (ICPP) and the Test Reactor Area (TRA).

Comment 43 : A Commentor questioned how, as stated at Page 36 of the Proposed Plan, additional monitoring can limit exposure? [C-W]

Response: We are sorry for the confusion. Monitoring of the groundwater does not limit exposure. Additional institutional controls will be used to control the usage of the contaminated groundwater and thus, limit exposure. Monitoring only provides a measure of contaminant levels.

Comment 44 : A Commentor was not clear on the difference between costs projected in Net Present Value versus "97$"s. [TW-W]

Response: Net Present Value (NPV) estimates are calculations of the costs taking into account the amount of money necessary today to pay for the project over the lifetime of the project when considering the expected inflationary factors. The total shown in "97$"s is the estimated cost prior to NPV calculation and is presented to provide an estimate of what the costs would be to DOE future budgets, assuming that the project is completed within a one year implementation timeframe. The use of NPV comes from the NCP and is used to provide a consistent and comparable basis used in cost estimating for decision-making purposes across the United States. For the NPV cost estimates presented, a timeframe of 100 years was used in the calculations.

Comment 45 : The INEEL CAB recommended the use of simplified formats and nomenclature in future Proposed Plans. [CAB-W]

Response: We agree that information presented to the public should be understandable and presented in a logical manner. The information on remediation of INTEC (ICPP) is complex, interrelated, and subject to interpretation. The OU 3-13 Proposed Plan presented information contained in the RI/BRA, FS, and FSS Reports. This information was summarized during the development of the Proposed Plan. For future projects, that are not as complex, a simplified format and nomenclature could be for the Proposed Plans.

Comment 46 : A Commentor recommended that the Agencies use the format employed in the Proposed Plan for WAG 1. [CAB-W]

Response: The Proposed Plan mentioned in the comment was developed after the OU 3-13 Proposed Plan and the amount of information contained and presented in the OU 3-13 Proposed Plan was considerably more than that contained in the WAG 1 Proposed Plan. Converting the OU 3-13 Proposed Plan to the format used for WAG 1 would have resulted in a much longer Proposed Plan. We agree that for simpler projects, the WAG 1 format should be used.

Comment 47 : A Commentor recommended the addition of graphics or maps to enhance the reader's ability to understand the terms used in the Proposed Plan [CAB-W]

Response: We recognize the confusion resulting from the use of the group numbers, OUs, and CPP numbers throughout the Proposed Plan. In the FFA/CO, INTEC (WAG 3) was divided into 13 OUs. Within each of these OUs, a number of release sites were listed using the CPP numbers. For the risk assessment conducted at INTEC, the RI/BRA Report and scoping investigations (Track 1 and 2 investigations), the release sites were evaluated on an individual basis (site by site using the CPP numbering system). At the conclusion of the RI/BRA, many release sites were found to present an acceptable risk and were not carried forward for remedial action under the FS Report. With the reduced number of sites for the FS, the group numbers were developed based on expected remedial actions, geographic location, and other factors.

Comment 48 : The INEEL CAB recommended that DOE-ID embrace Secretary Richardson's recent suggestion to communicate with "plain language." [CAB-W]

Response: We thank the CAB for their comment. INEEL Proposed Plans and Fact Sheets are generally written to be understandable by the general public. We recognize this as a continuing responsibility.

Comment 49 : A Commentor noted that the discussion of average flow rates in the SRPA could easily result in a conclusion that the contaminant plume is moving at the same linear rate as the water. Plain language would enhance the public's ability to more fully understand the issues that challenge the agency. [CAB-W]

Response: For certain contaminants like tritium (H-3), the movement of the contaminant is at the speed of groundwater. This is because the contaminant does not adsorb to the solid media (basalt) while moving with the groundwater. Other contaminants like Sr-90 adsorb and desorb as the groundwater move through the area. This results in the leading edge of a contamination plume moving with the groundwater. However, the concentrations at the leading edge are not necessarily at a concentration presenting a risk. It is recognized that this is a difficult topic to describe at a summary level.

Comment 50 : A Commentor questioned why the term Contaminants of Concern didn't seem to be carefully followed throughout the Proposed Plan. [U-W]

Response: The COCs for each of the groups are presented for the entire group. Within the various remediation groups, the COCs are dependent upon the location of contamination within the group. In the case of Group 5, the COCs outside of the INTEC fence are a subset of the entire set of COCs. Remedial actions will be undertaken to deal with the COCs at the spatial location of the remediation. As the remediation for group 5 under this ROD is dealing with outside of the INTEC fence, the two COCs are I-129 and Sr-90. Both of these contaminants will be considered in the remedial design and remedial action activities.

Comment 51 : A Commentor questioned the use of OU's, group numbers, and CPP numbers simultaneously as it was extremely confusing. [U-W]

Response: The use of group numbers, OUs, and CPP numbers was confusing. In the FFA/CO, the release sites are referred to by both OU numbers and release site numbers. For evaluation in the RI/BRA, risks at individual release sites were evaluated. In the FS, the sites presenting unacceptable risks were grouped together into the remedial action groups.

Comment 52 : A Commentor questioned the use of techno-babble, in a plan presented to the Public. [U-W]

Response: In the Agencies' opinion, considerable effort was expended in writing the Proposed Plan with a minimum amount of technical jargon for this very complex remediation project.

Comment 53 : A Commentor questioned the frequent bad grammar, punctuation, and so forth as abundant evidence that the INEEL either didn't care to hire a technical editor, or didn't bother letting the editor complete the job. [U-W]

Response: In trying to simplify a very complex project into understandable and summary information, some concepts may not have been fully or completely explained. The Agencies did employ professional technical editing and a public focus group in its development of the Proposed Plan.

Comment 54 : A Commentor suggested Proposed Plans and other public documents be carefully edited for clarity, accuracy, and conciseness, the readers are far less likely become so immediately exasperated that they scrutinize every part of the presentation to pounce on every possible problem. [U-W]

Response: We are sorry for the difficulty the Commentor had with understanding the plan. WAG 3 is a very complex site. Great effort was made to simplify and summarize highly technical concepts in layperson terms. Since the readership of the Proposed Plan has a wide range of backgrounds, the tradeoffs between too much information, versus too little detail, makes meeting the needs of all readers quite challenging. The science and analysis backing up the plan are the best available. The Proposed Plan, which is a summary document of the information in the RI/FS, presented a very complex project in a simplified and straightforward manner.

Comment 55 : A Commentor stated that in the Evaluation of Site Risks section of the Proposed Plan, the entire section was very unclear. [U-W]

Response: The Proposed Plan is a summary of the information contained in the RI/FS along with recommendations concerning selection of remedial action alternatives (preferred alternatives). The Proposed Plan summarized the information and referred the reader back to the RI/BRA for additional information, if necessary, for the risk assessment. Without summarizing and referencing the RI/BRA, the Evaluation of Site Risk section would have been considerably longer without presenting additional summary information.

Comment 56 : A Commentor asked why at Figure 9, page 13, of the Proposed Plan, didn't we label the injection well and the ICPP main stack? [U-W]

Response: We recognize that additional labeling (injection well and main INTEC stack) could have been added to the graphic. However, this graphic was intended to present in a simplified manner, the various pathways for exposure that exist at INTEC. Unfortunately, the Agencies believed that a simplified profile of the INTEC with the stack depicted was self-explanatory.

Comment 57 : A Commentor stated that the conceptual model graphic is lovely, and except for the incomplete labeling and too-small size, very informative. [U-W]

Response: We feel that the graphic presented a good conceptual representation of how the various exposure pathways are related to the contamination in the surface soils, perched water, contaminated groundwater. In addition the graphic presented a depiction of how the contamination can migrate.

Comment 58 : A Commentor stated, "Page 48, Table 11. The first heading is "Soil Group." That is wrong. The first group reads "Tank Farm." That is wrong. Under recommended alternatives, listing any for Group 1 is misleading. Only an interim action is described in the text. Under recommended alternatives, listing number 2 for Group 2 is misleading. The text indicates that Alternative 2 OR Alternative 3 may be selected, depending on discoveries made during D&D." [U-W]

Response: The Commentor is correct. "Soil Group" is a misleading heading. "Remedial Action Group" would have been a more accurate and clearer heading. However, the Tank Farm Soils (Group 1) are included within this ROD as a remedial action group. For Group 2, the selected remedy (recommended in the Proposed Plan) is Alternative 2. Alternative 3 for Group 2 would only be implemented if D&D removes the structure.

A.4. Current and Future Activities at INTEC

Comment 59 : A Commentor stated that it was extremely unlikely that the INTEC would ever become a residential area, if only due to the lack of water and the location. This was an assumption which is too conservative and which drives the conclusions to expensive alternatives. [TW-W]

Response: The use of the 100-year future residential scenario serves as our point of departure for making risk-based decisions that will affect the future use of the land for many generations. Beyond 100 years, it is difficult to predict what land use pressure may exist. Unless other extenuating circumstances exist (e.g., proximity to closed facilities requiring perpetual care) the assumption of future residential use provides a level of cleanup that assures the remedy will remain protective.

Comment 60 : A Commentor stated that "Institutional memory is short and if the past is any guide, people in the future may use contaminated resources for some time and make investments before they discover the contamination. They will then be faced with wrenching decisions of whether to abandon their investments or live with what would normally be unacceptable risk or pursue remediation that, in many cases, may be far more costly than the original remediation and waste management solutions." [BB-TI]

Response: As part of the implementation of the alternatives in the OU 3-13 ROD, a commitment is made to develop an "Institutional Control (IC) Plan." The approach to institutional controls for each Group is discussed in Section 11 of the ROD. The IC Plan will be developed during remedial action activities. This IC Plan will discuss the contaminated areas and the controls and periodic evaluations that will be placed on the areas over the long-term. In addition, the IC Plan discusses what will be required to release the areas for future developments or uses. This should minimize the impacts to future investments concerning the use of various areas.

Comment 61 : A Commentor stated their personal concern about the percolation ponds and about the use of the millions of gallons of water that are, basically, sucked up out of the aquifer, dispersed through this DOE facility and then dropped back down into the aquifer, pushing contaminants along. The Commentor believed that until cleanup was accomplished in a satisfactory way, DOE should not begin

another mission of any great extent at INEEL, particularly if it used the natural resources of water or the natural resources that are involved in generating electricity for these enterprises. [PA-TB]

Response: We share the Commentor's concern regarding the percolation ponds and their affect on the migration of contaminants based on their present location. This is why this action will require the shutdown of the ponds at their current location and care will be taken to eliminate future contaminant loadings to the aquifer.

Comment 62 : A Commentor stated concerns about the ongoing work of the plant after the cleanup and continued waste being put into the environment and aquifers. [JJ-TM]

Response: The ICDF will be used to contain and control waste from impacting the SRPA and surface receptors from many of the identified release sites. In addition, actions are planned to ensure that portion of the SRPA, a sole source aquifer, impacted by INTEC operations meets acceptable risk concentrations and drinking water MCLs for future users.

Comment 63 : A Commentor questioned what operations will occur at the ICPP in the future, specifically concerning uses for ICPP 691? [SRA-W]

Response: As the HLW at INTEC is required to be "road ready" by 2035, it was assumed that all treatment of the HLW was completed by 2035. Most of the operations planned at INTEC prior to 2095 will deal with the treatment of both the liquid waste in the Tank Farm and the waste in the calcine bins. In addition, activities dealing with spent nuclear fuel will occur until 2035. A period of 10 years was assumed to be needed for the disposition of the necessary INTEC facilities, which results in the year 2045. Depending on the decisions made for the Idaho HLW & FD EIS, the timeframes for the disposition of INTEC facilities could change. Currently, there is not a mission for the CPP-691 Facility. However, future activities at INTEC will consider the use of CPP-691 to accomplish the future activity in the decision.

Comment 64 : A Commentor questioned, "Where are we when we get there?" [MMS-TT]

Response: The Commentor is correct in that contaminated soils will be left behind at INTEC following the completion of cleanup activities. However, completion of the cleanup activities will result in the consolidation of contaminated soils restoring many existing contaminated areas to an acceptable risk level for both short-term and long-term impacts.

Comment 65 : A Commentor questioned why the use of the year 2095, and the 100 years figure. Where do these numbers come from? What are their significance? The Commentor noted that 100 years from now is 2099, not 2095. [U-W]

Response: The year 2095 and 100 years numbers are derived from the *Long-Term Land Use Future Scenarios for the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory*. In this future land use document, the area of INTEC was assumed to remain under federal control until 2095. Beyond 2095 the future land use document does not define the future land use at INTEC. Based on this future land use document, remediation of the INTEC area needs to be completed by 2095.

Comment 66 : A Commentor questioned what is the actual basis for the future resident evaluation, which assumes that people will be clamoring to build houses out here in 100 years? The Commentor further asked if the Agencies could produce regional economic forecasts, local county/city/real estate

association formulations, demonstrations, surveys, or plans that clearly document that such an interest and/or need exists? [U-W]

Response: In developing the *Long-Term Land Use Future Scenarios for the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory* document with various interested parties and groups, no consensus could be reached concerning the use of the INEEL beyond 2095. Based on this, risk assessment scenarios (current and 100 year future occupational along with 100-year future residential) were developed. These land use scenarios were used in the baseline risk assessment. This does not mean that INTEC will be used starting in 2095 for future residential development, but these are reasonably conservative assumptions to ensure that the remedial action is protective to future generations.

Comment 67 : A Commentor questioned that if no evidence exists to forecast a land scarcity so pressing as to require use of current INEEL areas for future suburbs, it seems that institutional controls would be much, much cheaper and far, far more realistic than removal. [U-W]

Response: The use of the 100-year future residential scenario serves as our point of departure for making risk-based decisions that will affect the future use of the land for many generations. Beyond 100 years, it is difficult to predict what land use pressure may exist. Unless other extenuating circumstances exist (e.g., proximity to closed facilities requiring perpetual care) the assumption of future residential use provides a level of cleanup that assures the remedy will remain protective.

A.5. WAG 3 Remediation Planning and Costs

Comment 68 : A Commentor recommended that a cost comparison be done between a Plan, based on a high radiation dose and current Plan. "The public should be informed of the cost differential. If the public is informed of the cost associated with little or no risk benefit, we do not believe they would approve the expenditure of millions of dollars on radiation protection that provides no measurable benefit." [C21-W]

Response: For sites listed on the NPL, cleanup must proceed to achieve an acceptable risk range listed in the NCP. Comparing the cleanup cost of a non-protective cleanup versus a protective cleanup is inappropriate. Only protective Alternatives are evaluated which meet this goal and the most cost-effective alternative selected. While there is some controversy over what constitutes an acceptable radiation risk, our best evidence supports the current approach of the linear no-threshold theory. This forms the basis for the protective levels established to protect our air and drinking water and is nationally accepted. As part of our 5-year review process, we will periodically review the protectiveness of our decisions and adjust to any updates in published protectiveness levels.

Comment 69 : A Commentor questioned why the Plan does not mention the fate of "IDW" still present at ICPP. [C-W]

Response: The Commentor is correct. A small amount of investigation derived waste (IDW) is remaining at INTEC. A section was added to this ROD to address the disposition of the existing IDW. The new section in the ROD also discusses the disposition of IDW that will be generated under the OU 3-14 RI/FS.

Comment 70 : A Commentor stated that the O&M costs for leaving VES-SFE-20 in place will not be increased significantly due to the fact that it is adjacent to CPP-603. Although it is shown to be a significant cost over time, it will not be significant since it will be done in conjunction with CPP-603 surveillance costs. [TW-W]

Response: The evaluation undertaken under OU 3-13 is of past practice sites (e.g., spills and abandoned sites). Other programs are currently evaluating operating and closing facilities to ensure that the public and environment are protected. The closure of CPP-603 is outside the scope of this action and therefore, the costs projected for VES-SFE-20 do not assume potential cost savings that may be realized.

Comment 71 : The Commentor asked about the remediation of Group 7 being completed well before any substantive action is taken on the main Tank Farm? [DK-TT]

Response: The Commentor is correct. The major portion of the remediation for the INTEC Tank Farm will occur after 2008. Remediation of the Group 7 SFE-20 Hot Waste Tank System will be completed will before the HLW tank at the Tank Farm.

Comment 72 : A Commentor stated "quit talking about nuclear waste clean up at INEEL and do it!" [RK-W]

Response: The CERCLA process at the INEEL is a carefully engineered and structured program that leads to specified cleanup and risk reductions. The process consists of: (1) evaluation of risks, (2) evaluation of response actions to reduce risk to acceptable levels, (3) selection of the response action, including public input on the selection process, and (4) implementation of the response action. This ROD has selected the response action to be implemented for the various contaminated areas at INTEC. Implementation of the various response actions will begin following approval (signature) of this ROD.

Comment 73 : A concern was expressed that "cleanup is being planned out of context with the previous operations. Although it is appropriate to indicate that the old mission of chemical processing in ICPP has forever ceased, it is dangerous to forget what went on there-the source of the waste and contamination. We have learned through involvement with other organizations and operations at other DOE sites that the cleanup of nuclear materials processing facilities requires careful planning, based on a detailed technical understanding of the conditions at the facility. For example the stabilization and cleanup of the PUREX and B-plant at Hanford (WA) was based on significant detailed knowledge of the operations of the facilities. The public had information on historic air emissions (including the Green Run), throughput of spent fuel and output of plutonium and uranium (including but not limited to HEU) and HLW. This information was useful for providing certain specific technical information useful in planning the cleanup, as well as providing a general sense (with factual support) of the operations leading to the existing problems (recent or historic, batch/campaign or steady state, etc.)." [SRA2-W]

Response: We understand the Commentor's concern with using appropriate information in the planning of cleanup activities. Cleanup operations are planned using the available information including information from previous operations. It is not necessary to know every operation that was conducted at a release site to plan the cleanup activities. Appropriate summary information is sufficient for planning purposes. During the implementation of remedial actions, planning includes actions to deal with the uncertainties. General information as to activities conducted at INTEC are discussed in Section 1 of the RI/BRA Report. This information discusses the major activities and facilities at INTEC. Discussion on the sources of contamination are discussed in the Sections 8 through 26 of the RI/BRA Report. Additional information is contained in the various Track 1 and Track 2 documents. The planning of remedial actions is based on the best available information. Information on historic air emissions can be found in the various monitoring report published at the INEEL.